

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed January 27, 2004, in which Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 were rejected and Claims 2, 3 and 5 were objected to. Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the reference cited therein. The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the Office Action and, when coupled with the amendments made herein, are believed to render all claims at issue patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claim 1 is amended herein. Claim 2 is cancelled, Claims 8 through 14 having been previously cancelled. New Claims 15 through 25 are submitted for consideration at this time. Accordingly, Claims 1, 3 through 7, and 15 through 25 are pending.

More particularly:

- Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the Examiner's claim objections and to include the limitations of former Claim 2.
- Original Claim 2 has been cancelled.
- New Claim 15 includes the limitations of amended Claim 1 and original Claim 3.

- New Claim 16 is substantially identical to original Claim 2.
- New Claim 17 is substantially identical to original Claim 4.
- New Claim 18 is substantially identical to original Claim 5.
- New Claim 19 is substantially identical to original Claim 6.
- New Claim 20 is substantially identical to original Claim 7
- New Claim 21 includes the limitations of amended Claim 1 and original

Claims 4 and 5.

- New Claim 22 is substantially identical to original Claim 2.
- New Claim 23 is substantially identical to original Claim 3.
- New Claim 24 is substantially identical to original Claim 6.
- New Claim 25 is substantially identical to original Claim 7.

All the changes herein are made for clarification and are based on the application and drawings as originally filed. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter is added.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

SPECIFICATION

With respect to Paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that

the title of the invention was not descriptive. Applicant has amended the title herein for clarification and respectfully submits that the title as currently presented is descriptive.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

With respect to Paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1 through 7 because of certain informalities. Specifically, the Examiner stated that (a) "cooperates" of line 9 of Claim 1 should be replaced with --cooperate-- and (b) "thereamong" of line 9 of Claim 1 should be deleted.

With respect to Paragraph 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claim 1 because the claim recited the limitations "...the other one of said first side edges...", "...the other one of said first corners..." and "...the other one of said second corners..." in lines 18 and 19, observing that there is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

Applicant has amended Claim 1 for clarification as set forth above and respectfully submits that the Examiner's objections are now overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added in making these amendments.

OBJECTED-TO CLAIMS

With respect to Paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Claims 2, 3 and 5 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant appreciates this allowability.

Independent Claim 1, amended herein to overcome the Examiner's objections, has been amended to include the limitations of former dependent Claim 2, now cancelled.

New independent Claim 15 is submitted at this time and includes the limitations of amended independent Claim 1 and dependent Claim 3. New Claims 16 through 20 are directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 15 as set forth above.

New independent Claim 21 is submitted at this time and includes the limitations of independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 4 and 5 (Claim 5 being dependent upon Claim 4). New Claims 22 through 25 are directly dependent upon Claim 21 as set forth above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. SECTION 103(a)

With respect to Paragraphs 5 through 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over US published patent application No. 2002/0047128 to Song *et al.* in view of the admitted prior art.

Of the rejected claims only Claim 1 is independent.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the amendments made to independent Claim 1 as set forth above to include the limitations of former Claim 2, which has been deemed allowable if combined with Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

The remaining rejected claims depend directly or indirectly upon Claim 1 and are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending Claims 1, 3 through 7, and 15 through 25 as currently presented are in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner disagrees, please call the undersigned attorney at 202-624-3947 in an effort to resolve any matter still outstanding *before* issuing another action. The undersigned attorney is confident that any issue which might remain can readily be worked out by telephone.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas T. Moga
Registration No. 34,881
Attorney for Applicant

DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
1901 L Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-457-0160

Dated: **May 27, 2004**